DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 688 EC 132 426

AUTHOR Davis, Sharon: Cave, Odessa
TITLE A Review of Selected Inservice Training Components of States' 1978-79 Annual Program Plans.
INSTITUTION Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities: Elementary Secondary Education: *Individualized Education Programs: *Inservice Teacher Education: National Surveys: *State Programs

ABSTRACT

The inservice training sections of annual program plans of 49 states were reviewed to determine states' responses to specific regulations. All states indicated needs for training, most frequently specifying the individualized education program as the area in which training was needed. Other high priority areas reported were least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and diagnostic procedures. Regular class teachers, parents of handicapped children, and special class teachers ranked as the top three personnel targets of training. Other components of inservice reviewed were processes for determining training needs, record analysis, strtegies for training, uses of incentives, sources of funding, and evaluation procedures. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198688

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A REVIEW OF SELECTED INSERVICE TRAINING COMPONENTS OF STATES' 1978-79 ANNUAL PROGRAM PLANS

Sharon Davis,
Project Director

Odessa Cave,
Educational Specialist

June 1979

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 ASSOCIATION DRIVE
RESTON, VA 22091

EC 132 426

The work herein was done pursuant to a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Needs Assessment Methodologies	3
The Priority Areas of Training	6
The Target Population	9
Priority Areas by Target Population	12
Delivery of Training	15
Training Strategies/Formats	16
Staff Training Source	17
Use of Incentives	18
Funding Sources	19
Evaluation of the Inservice Training	20
Summary and Conclusions	22
Bibliography	24
Appendix A - List of States Included in this Report	25
Appendix B - Rules and Regulations for the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development	26
Appendix C - Major Areas of Inservice Training and Representative Topics Included	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
Table I:	Inservice Training Needs Reported by States in Table 5 of Their Annual Program Plan	7
Table II:	Additional Major Areas of Inservice Training Needs Reported by States	9
Table III:	The Target Populations to Receive Training	10
Table IV:	Summary of Table 5 from Forty-Nine Annual Program Plans	13
Table V:	Ranking of Priority Training Topics for Priority Personnel Groups	14
Table VI:	Inservice Training Strategies Used by States	16
Table VII:	Staff Training Sources Reported by States	17
Table VIII:	Incentives Offered by States to Insure Participation in Inservice Training	19
Table IX:	Funding Sources for Inservice Training	20
Table X:	Inservice Evaluation Procedures Reported by States	21

Introduction

One of the recurring concerns associated with implementing P. L. 94-142 is related to the degree to which regular education personnel are trained and/or feel able to appropriately teach handicapped children. Because of this concern, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) has been actively working with teachers' organizations to find ways to meet the training needs of teachers.[1] BEH's Division of Personnel Preparation (DPP), which has been supporting the training of regular educators since 1974, designated forty-eight percent of its 1978-79 budget for inservice training.[2] In addition to BEH/DPP support of inservice training through Part D funds of the Education of the Handicapped Act (Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped), states may also use a portion of the P. L. 94-142 (Part B) allotment for inservice training. One of the requirements of this Act is that each state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development must include "the inservice training of general and special educational instructional, related services, and support personnel."[3]

Because of the need for appropriate inservice training, there has been much interest in how states are responding to this priority. The Council for Exceptional Children, as part of a project[4] designed to assist inservice planners to appropriately identify inservice

---

[1]Edwin W. Martin, "Foreword," The Map, the Mission and the Mandate, ed. Judy Smith, p. viii.

[2]James Siantz and Edward Moore, "Inservice Programming and Preservice Priorities," The Map, the Mission and the Mandate, ed. Judy Smith, p. 27.

[3]Federal Register, Tuesday, August 23, 1977, Part II, p. 42492.

[4]The Design, Development and Implementation of a National Replicable Inservice Needs Assessment Project funded by BEH/DPP.

training needs of their personnel, has reviewed the inservice training section of states' 1978-79 annual program plans to assess how states are addressing these needs.

In order to receive funds under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, each state is required to submit an annual program plan to the U. S. Commissioner of Education which contains provisions specified in the rules and regulations for implementing the law. One of the components of the plan must be the "description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development."[1] One part of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development includes inservice training. This study was designed to gather information pertaining to selected components of the inservice training section of state's annual program plans. The collection of data focused on seven areas:

- Needs Assessment Methodologies
- Priority Areas of Training
- Target Population (Personnel Groups to Receive Training)
- Training Delivery (Strategies/Formats, Staff Sources)
- Incentives Offered to Participants
- Funding Sources
- Evaluation Model for Determining Effectiveness of Training

The data collection effort was conducted from September 1978 through February 1979. Plans were reviewed as they became available. An effort was made to review plans as they received approval (or partial approval), but eventually it became necessary to include some plans that had not yet received official approval by BEH. At the time of the cut-off date for reviewing plans, seven states and two territories remained unavailable. Consequently, this analysis includes forty-four states, the District of Columbia, and four territories. For this report, the District of Columbia and the four territories will be referred to as states. (Appendix A lists each of the states included in this analysis.)

---

[1] Federal Register, op. cit.

The presentation and analysis of the data gathered from the state plans will be organized around the pertinent federal regulation. (See Appendix B for the Education of the Handicapped Act regulations which apply to the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development.) Where appropriate, comparisons will also be made with results of a review of 1977-78 annual program plans conducted by CEC in 1977 under the auspices of another project.[1] However, this comparative analysis is limited by the differences in the components of the two reviews of state plans. When states submitted their 1977-78 plans, the final regulations had not yet been promulgated. This year's study was designed to gather more extensive information than the prior CEC study because it was assumed that state plans developed with the guidance of the regulations would be more comprehensive.

The Needs Assessment Methodologies

Since needs assessment should be the basis for planning inservice training, this study investigated how states determine inservice training needs. According to section 121a.382(f)(1) of the federal rules and regulations implementing P. L. 94-142, each state's annual program plan must "describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children.[2]" Thirty-seven states discussed the manner in which they conducted needs assessment which generated the list of priority areas of inservice training topics in Tables I and II. This is a noticeable increase above the nineteen states which discussed needs assessment procedures in the 1977-78 annual program plans.[3]

---

[1]Carolyn Rude, "An Analysis of Priority Topic Areas and Personnel for Inservice Training Indicated in Fifty Annual Program Plans," 1978.

[2] Federal Register, op. cit.

[3]Rude, op. cit., p. 10.

States reported on a variety of methods for determining inservice training needs.[1] For this report, the methods are categorized under five major headings as follows:

1. Analysis of existing records (Named by 22 states)

   - Program reviews (compliance/monitoring of special education programs)
   - Mandates of laws for the handicapped (state, federal)
   - Analysis of individualized education programs and existing statistical data
   - Local education agency annual application
   - Child count data
   - Review of professional literature
   - Due process mediation -- appeals procedures
   - Review of staff records (personnel records)
   - Tabulation of training requests from LEAs

2. Surveys/questionnaires (Named by 22 states)

   - Formal/informal
   - Statewide
   - LEA

3. Collecting opinions of others (Named by 18 states)

   - Formal/informal feedback
   - Advisory groups
   - Open forums
   - Task force
   - Cooperative planning with other state and federal agencies

4. Observation and interaction (Named by 9 states)

   - Workshops
   - Conferences - statewide, administrative, higher education
   - Meetings - LEA, State Department of Education
   - Inservice training activities (institutes, etc.)
   - Conventions - statewide

5. Other (Named by 2 states)

   - Inservice Planner's Primer (several techniques)
   - Prince William Model

---

[1] Because many states were vague about their needs assessment process, the findings and categorization of them are subject to errors of interpretation of what states said they did.

Many states used more than one method in determining needs. However, the most common methods utilized are analyzing existing records and conducting surveys. Many SEA records can be used to identify needs for inservice training. For example, SEA records on program reviews may indicate staff deficiencies which could be remedied through inservice training. Also, an analysis of the content and quality of IEPs developed by various LEAs may reveal weaknesses which indicate a need for training. States reported nine different types of existing records which they use in determining training needs.

Twenty-two states reported doing a survey to assess needs. This typically involves the administration of a questionnaire to a state-wide sample of personnel. States also solicit the judgment of individuals in identifying inservice training needs. Some states used advisory groups and task forces for this purpose. Some held open forums, while others relied on informal feedback from individuals. Nine states mentioned needs assessment methods which were categorized as observation and interaction. By observing educators in the classroom during inservice training, and at other meetings, much can be learned about inservice training needs. Two specialized needs assessment techniques were also mentioned.

While a few states described their needs assessment procedures in detail, most used general terms in writing about their process. For instance, a state may have reported that one way they do needs assessment is through workshops. It was assumed that they meant they observed workshop experiences and noted the training needs that seemed evident. It could be, though, that they collected opinions of others through interviews or that they distributed a needs assessment questionnaire to the workshop participants.

This review of needs assessment processes reported in state plans reveals that some states need to be more specific about how they do needs assessment. One explanation for states' absence of specificity in reporting on their process for determining inservice

training needs may be that there is some confusion with the regulations. Needs assessment is referred to in both the Personnel Development Plan section (121a.383) and the Inservice Training section (121a.382). The Personnel Development Plan section instructs states to describe the results of the needs assessment conducted as required by section 121a.382(b)(1) with respect to identifying needed areas of training and assigning priorities to those areas and to identify the target populations for personnel development. The Inservice Training section 121a.382(b)(1) requires that "the State educational agency conducts an annual needs assessment to determine if a sufficient number of qualified personnel are available in the State." This section also requires (f)(1) that "each annual program plan must describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children."

All states included in this review reported on needs for personnel. However, this tabulation of needs assessment methodologies reveals that not all states described in detail the process used in determining the inservice training needs of the personnel. To assist states in the preparation of their plan, the Project on Cooperative Manpower Planning in Special Education[1], funded by BEH, has just completed a handbook for states to use as a tool for planning and carrying out the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. This resource should assist states in preparing more comprehensive plans in the future.

The Priority Areas of Training

Another component of the inservice training plan is the states' identification of needed areas of training. Section 121a.382(f)(2) of the regulations for implementation of P. L. 94-142 states that "each annual program plan must identify the areas in which

---

[1]R. Schofer, Investigator, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

training is needed (such as individualized education programs, non-discriminatory testing, least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and surrogate parents)." The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) application form for the P. L. 94-142 Part B formula grant program includes directions and tables for the states to use in preparing the annual program plan.[1] Table 5, Inservice Training Form, is used by states to record the number and types of persons projected to receive inservice training in particular areas. Data from this table was tabulated to identify the states' reported needs for training particular personnel in the nine topics specified by BEH. These nine areas of training and the number and percent of states reporting training needs in these areas are presented in Table I.

Table I: INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS REPORTED BY STATES IN TABLE 5 OF THEIR ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN

Area of Training	States Reporting Needs	
	Number	Percent
Individualized Education Program (IEP)	49	100
Least Restrictive Environment	46	94
Procedural Safeguards	46	94
Diagnostic Procedures	46	94
Instructional Procedures	44	90
Non-Discriminatory Testing	43	88
Implementation of P. L. 94-142	39	80
Use of Surrogates	39	80
Priorities - Served - Unserved	34	69

All states from which data were collected (49) reported a need for inservice training concerning individualized education programs. This topic was followed closely by least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and diagnostic procedures. In fact, 80 percent of the states reported that they had inservice training needs in all these

[1]Annual Program Plan Amendment for Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act as Amended by P. L. 94-142, OE Form 9055, July 1979.

topics except "priorities - served - unserved" which was reported as a need by sixty-nine percent of states. In the narrative of the annual program plans, the states described in more detail the specific training topics which would be covered under these nine major areas. For example, some of the training topics concerning IEPs are: (1) how to develop an IEP; (2) monitoring, reviewing, and implementing IEPs; (3) how to write goals and objectives; and (4) conducting individual planning conferences. (Refer to Appendix C for a summary of topics found under the major areas of training.)

The areas of training listed in BEH Table 5 have been identified by BEH as priority areas Since states were expected to submit Table 5 with their annual program plans, this may have resulted in these areas of training being the ones mentioned most often by states. However, states also reported additional areas of need for inservice training. This review determined that these needs spanned a variety of inservice training topics which were difficult to categorize under major training areas. It was decided not to group topics where there was no clear category to use, for it seemed more informative to list all topics. Thus, thirty-five other areas of training beyond those mentioned by states in Table 5 were identified. Those additional areas of training which were mentioned by at least ten states are presented in Table II. (Appendix C contains a summary of all training topics reported by states.)

There may be some overlapping of the topics in Table II with those in Table I, but it was felt that these eight areas of training should receive separate mention. Many of the topics included within these areas did not appear to be related as much to the requirements of the regulations for P. L. 94-142 as those in Table I. Instead many topics related more to general special education (updating special educators' professional skills, orientation to handicapping conditions) or focused on the need for providing training

in specialized areas (vocational and career education, physical education and therapeutic recreation, early childhood.) One topic for regular educators was "techniques and procedures for modifying regular programs." Parents were being offered training in "home and family education" and "establishing and enhancing the role of the advisory council." A topic included under delivery of services was "strategies for transportation of handicapped students."

Table II: ADDITIONAL MAJOR AREAS OF INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS REPORTED BY STATES

Area of Training	States Reporting Needs	
	Number	Percent
Updating professional skills of special educators	19	39
Training regular educators to work with handicapped children in the regular classroom	17	35
Workshops for parents	16	33
Delivery of services	14	29
Orientation to handicapping conditions	13	27
Vocational and career education	12	24
Preparation of adapted physical education and therapeutic recreation specialists	10	20
Early childhood	10	20

The Target Population

After identifying priority areas of training, the personnel groups identified by states to receive this training were investigated. Section 121a.382(f)(3) of the rules and regulations for implementation of P. L. 94-142 states that "each annual program plan must specify the groups requiring training (such as special teachers, regular teachers, administrators, psychologists, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical education teachers, therapeutic recreation specialists, physical therapists, occupational

therapists, medical personnel, parents, volunteers, hearing officers, and surrogate parents)." BEH's Table 5 is designed in such a way that states report on numbers to receive inservice training in twenty-three categories. The target populations projected to receive inservice training in fiscal year 1979 were ranked based on total number of personnel reported in Table 5's for the states' annual program plans. Table III presents the results of this ranking process.

Table III: THE TARGET POPULATIONS TO RECEIVE TRAINING

Rank	Target Population	Number of Persons Needing Training
1	Regular Class Teachers	12,529,534
2	Parents of Handicapped Children	2,093,162
3.	Special Class Teachers	333,073
4	Administrators	149,881
5.	Supervisors	145,555
6	Resource Room Teachers	118,370
7	Teacher Aides	98,131
8	Volunteers	63,331
9	Speech Pathologists	49,334
10	Physical Educators	44,088
11	Itinerant/Consulting Teachers	41,223
12	Vocational Educators	37,816
13	Psychologists	33,376
14	Surrogates	28,749
15	Other Non-Instructional Staff	17,848
16	School Social Workers	16,917
17	Psychometrists/Educational Diagnosticians	16,453
18	Home-Hospital Teachers	16,031
19	Hearing Officers	6,894
20	Work-Study Coordinators	5,775
21	Occupational Therapists	4,269
22	Audiologists	1,616
23	Recreational Therapists	1,354

The figures reported in Table III for the number of persons needing training is the total receiving training in all nine topics listed in Table 5. Therefore, there is considerable duplication in this count. A state may report that five thousand regular educators need training in each of the nine topic areas. This would total 45,000, when actually the five thousand regular educators being trained may be the same ones for each topic -- only five thousand different individuals. There is no way of determining the amount of duplication for each target population, but the totals do give an overall indication of where the states feel the needs are for inservice training in this country.

As Table III indicates, regular class teachers are by far the group projected to receive the greatest amount of inservice training in all nine topics. This is consistent with BEH's desire to meet the needs for inservice training of regular education personnel. Parents of handicapped children are second in total numbers to receive inservice training, followed by special class teachers (third), administrators (fourth), supervisors (fifth), and resource room teachers in sixth place. The numbers to be trained for the remaining categories of personnel are far fewer than the top six. Five of these top six personnel groups are the same as the high priority groups reported by states to need training in 1977-78[1]. Resource room teachers were not in the top six at that time. This review of the populations to be trained reveals that states are providing inservice training to all those involved in the arena of education including the teachers, administrators, nurses, community agency personnel, custodians, cafeteria workers and clerical and transportation personnel. Although states listed many topics in addition to BEH Table 5 topics as priority areas of need, they did not necessarily mention the personnel or numbers of personnel to be trained in these areas beyond Table 5 requirements. This means that the actual number of people trained may be higher than reported.

---

[1]Rude, op. cit., p. 7.

Priority Areas by Target Population

The inservice training topics which are high priority in the states and the priority personnel who are to receive training have been discussed. This study next analyzed the data to determine which priority personnel groups were to receive inservice training in the priority topic areas. In order to do this, a table was developed which illustrates the number of states that are offering each of the nine priority topics to each of the twenty-three personnel groups. (This is essentially a summary of BEH's Table 5 portraying numbers of states offering the training instead of numbers of personnel projected to receive training.) This data is presented in Table IV.

In order to determine what personnel groups were considered highest priority for training in each of the nine priority areas of training, Table IV was used to rank order the personnel groups for each topic according to the total number of states that reported they were going to train personnel in each group. For instance, Table IV reveals that for training in IEPs, regular and special class teachers were listed by forty-one states, tying them for first place rankings. Resource room teachers were being trained in IEPs by thirty-four states, putting them second; and third to receive such training were supervisors, mentioned by thirty-three states. Personnel for each topic were ranked in this manner. This ranking resulted in the six highest priority personnel groups previously identified on the basis of total numbers to be trained being placed in the first three ranks for all topics except two, non-discriminatory testing and diagnostic procedures. This confirms the original determination of the personnel that the states view as highest priority for training (Table III). The results of this analysis are presented in Table V.

Table IV: SUMMARY OF TABLE 5 FROM FORTY-NINE ANNUAL PROGRAM PLANS

AREA OF TRAINING	NUMBER OF STATES INDICATING TYPES OF PERSONS TO RECEIVE INSERVICE TRAINING																					
	Regular Class Teachers	Special Class Teachers	Resource Room Teachers	Itinerant/Consulting Teachers	Home-Hospital Teachers	Physical Educators	Vocational Educators	Teacher Aides	Work-Study Coordinators	Recreational Therapists	Occupational Therapists	Speech Pathologists	Audiologists	Psychometrists/Educational Diagnosticians	Psychologists	School Social Workers	Parents of Handicapped Children	Surrogates	Volunteers	Hearing Officers	Supervisors	Administrators	Other Non-Instructional Staff
Individualized Education Program (IEP)	41	41	34	27	29	32	28	27	23	15	23	32	23	25	30	27	28	23	14	20	33	32	24
Least Restrictive Environment	38	33	26	24	21	23	23	23	21	12	17	22	15	22	27	26	31	26	12	20	27	33	21
Procedural Safeguards	33	32	24	24	22	18	19	21	21	12	17	23	24	24	24	26	32	25	15	30	32	37	20
Instructional Procedures	37	41	33	31	22	27	28	32	22	16	22	27	19	21	21	17	22	14	17	13	27	26	17
Non-Discriminatory Testing	25	30	24	21	20	17	17	15	18	11	18	21	18	31	33	19	23	18	11	17	30	23	16
Diagnostic Procedures	31	35	30	25	20	23	22	16	19	14	24	26	23	33	29	22	19	14	12	12	26	22	18
Implementation of P. L. 94-142	33	33	26	25	21	25	23	24	21	14	21	25	22	20	27	25	29	21	16	21	30	37	23
Use of Surrogates	18	21	17	14	16	13	12	12	13	9	12	14	12	19	17	20	25	25	13	18	27	28	12
Priorities-Served-Unserved	22	28	21	30	18	14	14	15	16	8	13	17	15	20	17	17	22	16	11	17	22	24	14

TABLE V: RANKING OF PRIORITY TRAINING TOPICS FOR PRIORITY PERSONNEL GROUPS

NINE HIGHEST PRIORITY AREAS OF TRAINING	SIX HIGHEST PRIORITY PERSONNEL GROUPS					
	Regular Class Teachers	Special Class Teachers	Resource Room Teachers	Parents of Handicapped Children	Supervisors	Administrators
Individualized Education Program (IEP)	1 (41)	1 (41)	2 (34)		3 (33)	
Least Restrictive Environment	1 (38)	2 (33)		3 (31)		2 (33)
Procedural Safeguards	2 (33)	3 (32)		3 (32)	3 (32)	1 (37)
Instructional Procedures	2 (37)	1 (41)	3 (33)			
Non-Discriminatory Testing[a]		3 (30)			3 (30)	
Diagnostic Procedures[b]	3(31)	1 (35)				
Implementation of P. L. 94-142	2 (33)	2 (33)			3 (30)	1 (37)
Use of Surrogates				3 (25)	2 (27)	1 (28)
Priorities - Served - Unserved	3 (22)	1 (28)		3 (22)	3 (22)	2 (24)

Table entries indicate rank order of personnel to be trained in each training topic based on the overall ranking for all personnel groups in Table IV. Figures in parentheses are the number of states reporting training needs.

[a]First Priority group (33 states) is psychologists, second (31 states) is psychometrists/educational diagnosticians.

[b]Second priority group (33 states) is psychometrists/educational diagnosticians

Seven areas of training are high priority for regular class teachers with individualized education program (IEP) and least restrictive environment ranking highest. Special class teachers are projected to need training in eight areas with IEP, instructional procedures, diagnostic procedures, and priorities - served - unserved receiving first rankings. Resource room teachers are reported to need training in IEP and instructional procedures. Parents of handicapped children are to receive training in four priority areas, all ranked third -- least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, use of surrogates, priorities - served - unserved. Supervisors are projected to receive training in six areas, none ranking first in priority, while administrators have priority need for training in five areas, three of which are ranked first -- procedural safeguards, implementation of P. L. 94-142, use of surrogates. These data concerning personnel groups to be trained in the priority topics offer evidence that states are planning to meet the training needs of the significant personnel who are implementing P. L. 94-142.

Delivery of Training

In reviewing annual program plans to determine how states propose to deliver inservice training, this study focused on two areas -- training strategies/formats and staff training sources. There was considerable variation in states' reporting of their training delivery. While some gave detailed descriptions; others were vague. It appears that states have reported more detail regarding their training delivery this year than they did last year, although comparisons are difficult to make because of differences in types of data gathered between last year's and this year's reports. Last year's review focused on states' reporting of training resources and generally found them to be minimally described. This year's review investigated the nature of the training and staff training sources, since states are required by the regulations for P. L. 94-142 to describe these two areas.

Training Strategies/Formats

Section 121a.382(f)(4) of the rules and regulations for implementing P. L. 94-142 requires states to "describe the content and nature of training for each (training area which they list as needed in the state plan)." Training topics have already been described under the areas of training proposed by the state. This part of the report focuses on the "nature" of the training which was interpreted to be the training strategy or format. Thirty-two states reported on their delivery method for training. These various strategies or formats are summarized in Table VI.

Table VI: INSERVICE TRAINING STRATEGIES USED BY STATES

Training Strategy or Format	Number of States
Workshops	19
Inservice courses	11
Institutes	9
Demonstrations	7
Audiovisual media	7
College courses	7
In-School training teams	5
Visits to observe other programs	3
Training packages	3
Local, state, regional, and national conferences	2
Discussion groups	1
Seminars	1
Simulation activities	1
Publications	1

Table VI reveals that fourteen different training strategies were reported by states. Workshops are the most frequently mentioned strategy for providing training (19 states) followed by inservice courses (11 states). Five other strategies ranked closely in frequency of mention -- institutes, demonstrations, audiovisual media, college courses, and

inservice training teams. These five, however, were mentioned by only five to nine states. The figures on numbers of states suggest that each state probably uses two to three different training strategies -- not much total variety when so many strategies are available. This data came from thirty-two states which means that seventeen states did not describe in detail the nature of the inservice training they planned to provide.

Staff Training Source

Another area of the regulations, section 121a.382(f)(5), asks states to "describe how the training will be provided in terms of geographical scope ... and staff training source ...." State plans were reviewed to determine the staff training source, such as college and university, state and local educational agency, and non-agency personnel. Table VII presents this information.

Table VII: STAFF TRAINING SOURCES REPORTED BY STATES

Staff Training Source	Number of States
State educational agency	29
College or university	26
Local educational agency	20
Other agencies and organizations	14
Resource centers	13
Consultants	7
Intermediate educational units	4
Advocates	1

Forty-three states reported how they would provide training in terms of staff training source. In twenty-nine states the state education agency itself planned to deliver inservice training. In twenty-six states colleges and universities would be instrumental in providing training. Local educational agencies would provide training in

twenty states. The next most frequently mentioned were other agencies and organizations and resource centers. Seven states mentioned using consultants. Many states mentioned more than one source for training. One of the problems with interpreting this data is that it was not always clear from the annual program plan as to the specifics of the involvement of these staff sources.

Use of Incentives

In addition to offering inservice training to various personnel groups, states are required to provide incentives to insure participation. Section 121a.382(e)(1) of the federal rules and regulations for the implementation of P. L. 94-142 states that "each annual program plan must provide that the state educational agency insures that on-going inservice training programs are available to all personnel who are engaged in the education of handicapped children and that these programs include the use of incentives which insure participation by teachers (such as released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills)." While states are required to insure that incentives are used to encourage participation in inservice training, this statement does not require a written description of the particular incentives used. It was found, though, that twenty-one states did report the incentives they offer to encourage participation. This information is presented in Table VIII.

As can be seen, released time is the most common incentive offered by states. Arranging for college credit, reimbursing inservice participants for their expenses, and granting certification credit are also frequently mentioned. Seven states reported that they rely on teachers' desires to update their professional skills as an incentive. Only three states reported paying individuals to participate. Although not generally thought of

as an incentive, accessibility to training institutes was mentioned by two states. This reflects an assumption that if training is offered in a convenient location that more persons will be inclined to participate.

Table VIII: INCENTIVES OFFERED BY STATES TO INSURE PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE TRAINING

Incentive	Number of States Offering this Incentive
Released time	16
College credit (academic credit)	14
Reimbursement for expenses (tuition, travel, etc.)	14
Certification credit	13
Salary step credit (increment)	9
Professional growth or updating of professional skills	7
Payment for participation	3
Accessibility to training institutes	2

Funding Sources

Another requirement for each state's annual program plan is that it must specify the funding sources to be used for providing inservice training [section 121a.382 (f)(6)(i)]. This information was tabulated and indicates that states cited eleven different sources of funds. Table IX presents this information.

This list was derived from thirty-nine states which named their funding sources in their state plan. Most states used a combination of funding for their programs. Part D funds, Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, was the source most widely used. This was followed by state, Part B, and local funds. A variety of other sources

were also named. Since there was no requirement to specify the amount of money coming from these various sources, this study was unable to determine the precise weight of the federal funds. Federal sources were cited most often.

Table IX: FUNDING SOURCES FOR INSERVICE TRAINING

Funding Source	Number of States
Part D, Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped	33
State	20
Part B, EHA - Assistance for Education of All Handicapped Children	20
Local	17
Part C, EHA - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped	12
Federal (specific source not cited)	6
Private Monies (university or private organizations)	3
P. L. 89-313, Amendments to Title I, ESEA - Programs for Handicapped Children	3
Part G, EHA - Special Programs for Children with Specific Learning Disabilities	3
Part E, EHA - Research in the Education of the Handicapped	1
Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Strengthening states and local education agencies	1

Evaluation of the Inservice Training

A final requirement of the P. L. 94-142 regulations for inservice training is that "each annual program plan must specify the procedures for effective evaluation of the extent to which program objectives are met [section 121a.382(f)(7)]." Thirty states discussed their plans for evaluating the inservice training program. A summary of the procedures which they indicated they will use is presented in Table X.

Table X: INSERVICE EVALUATION PROCEDURES REPORTED BY STATES

Procedures for Inservice Evaluation	Number of States
Participant evaluation	11
Discrepancy evaluation model	7
Program review by SEA	4
Monitoring of activities by SEA	4
On-site visits by SEA	4
Third party evaluators	4
Committee review of inservice training	4
Pre- and post-tests	3
Instructor's assessment of competency attained by trainees	3
Performance observation of trainees on the job	3

The procedure mentioned most often (11 states) was participant evaluation where the states proposed to have trainees evaluate their inservice program. Seven states reported that they would use the discrepancy evaluation model. Even though most of these were planning to use this model to evaluate the total Comprehensive System of Personnel Development and did not focus specifically on the inservice training section, they were included in the tabulation of evaluation procedures. The remaining eight procedures were cited by three or four states each.

Based upon this analysis of the actual evaluation descriptions, this appears to be an area in which state plan developers could use assistance. Few states specified evaluation procedures in the comprehensive plan. Statements such as "evaluation is inherent in all training activities," "the committee will evaluate on an ongoing basis as well as a yearly basis the extent to which personnel development objectives and activities are carried out," and "the participants completed an evaluation form" were the extent of the response of some states to specifying the evaluation procedures. It is not clear how some so-called "procedures" which the states report in the annual program plan will actually result in an

evaluation of the training programs. Because developing inservice program evaluation plans has been recognized as an area in which state planners need assistance, the Evaluation Training Consortium[1], funded by BEH, has recently piloted a new workshop on the "Evaluation of Inservice Programs." This will be presented in various parts of the country, so that states should be able to take advantage of this training in order to improve their development of evaluation procedures for their state plans.

Summary and Conclusions

The inservice training section of annual program plans from forty-nine states (forty-four states, the District of Columbia, four territories) was reviewed to assess how states were responding to particular regulations. All forty-nine states identified needs for training, with individualized education program being the most frequently mentioned area in which training was needed. States also reported that least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and diagnostic procedures were high priority areas of training. All states also reported on the personnel groups they were targeting to receive training. The highest priority group was regular class teachers, followed by parents of handicapped children, and special class teachers.

The other components of the inservice section which were reviewed were not discussed by all states in their plans. Thirty-seven states reported on their process for determining training needs. The analysis of existing records and the use of surveys and questionnaires were the most frequently mentioned. Thirty-two states reported on fourteen different strategies for training, with workshops and inservice courses receiving the most mentions. The two sources of staff which were most often mentioned are SEA's and colleges

---

[1]Robert O. Brinkerhoff, Director, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

or universities according to the forty-three states that discussed staff for the inservice training. Twenty-one states reported that the incentives which were most frequently used were released time, college credit, reimbursement for expenses, and certification credit. The sources of funding reported by thirty-nine states were varied, with federal sources mentioned most often. Finally, thirty states discussed their evaluation procedures. Participant evaluation and the discrepancy evaluation model were mentioned most often.

The 1978-79 annual program plans which were reviewed for this study were the first to be submitted in response to the final regulations for P. L. 94-142. While these plans appear to be more comprehensive than the 1977-78 state plans, some still need to be further developed. Clearly, as the states gain more experience in developing and implementing the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), including inservice training, their reporting in their annual program plans will improve. In addition, many of the states are taking advantage of the various types of technical assistance offered by BEH such as: The Evaluation Training Consortium for assistance in evaluation design, Project on Cooperative Manpower Planning in Special Education for overall CSPD design, the National Inservice Network for CSPD implementation, and CEC's Needs Assessment Project for designing needs assessments and identifying inservice training needs.

This is the second year that CEC has reviewed annual program plans. A third analysis will be carried out with 1979-80 plans. A data base now has been established which will assist in tracking the progress of states in inservice training plan development. The information gained from this review needs to be interpreted by inservice planners and providers in terms of implications for their particular organization or constituency as they work to improve inservice training opportunities for all personnel involved in the education ot handicapped children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Federal Register. Tuesday, August 23, 1977, Part II.

Martin, Edwin W. "Foreword," The Map, the Mission and the Mandate, ed. Judy Smith. Pennsylvania: Educational Resource Center, 1978.

Rude, Carolyn R. "An Analysis of Priority Topic Areas and Personnel Inservice Training Indicated in Fifty Annual Program Plans." Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Siantz, James and Edward Moore. "Inservice Programming and Preservice Priorities," The Map, the Mission and the Mandate. ed. Judy Smith. Pennsylvania: Educational Resource Center, 1978.

Appendix A

LIST OF STATES INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

Annual program plans from forty-four states, the District of Columbia, and four territories were reviewed for the preparation of this report. The annual program plans from nine states were not available. The states and territories which were included in this review are listed below.

Alabama (AL)
Alaska (AK)
Arizona (AZ)
Arkansas (AR)
California (CA)
Connecticut (CT)
Delaware (DE)
District of Columbia (DC)
Florida (FL)
Georgia (GA)
Hawaii (HI)
Idaho (ID)
Illinois (IL)
Indiana (IN)
Iowa (IA)
Kansas (KS)
Kentucky (KY)
Louisiana (LA)
Maine (ME)
Maryland (MD)
Massachusetts (MA)
Michigan (MI)
Minnesota (MN)
Mississippi (MS)
Missouri (MO)
Nebraska (NB)
Nevada (NV)
New Hampshire (NH)
New Jersey (NJ)
New York (NY)
North Carolina (NC)
Ohio (OH)
Oklahoma (OK)
Oregon (OR)
Pennsylvania (PA)
Rhode Island (RI)
South Carolina (SC)
South Dakota (SD)
Tennessee (TN)
Texas (TX)
Utah (UT)
Vermont (VT)
Virginia (VA)
Washington (WA)
Wyoming (WY)
Guam (GU)
Northern Marianas (No. Mar.)
Puerto Rico (PR)
Virgin Islands (VI)

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

§ 121a.380 Scope of system.

Each annual program plan must include a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which includes:

(a) The inservice training of general and special educational instructional, related services, and support personnel;

(b) Procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are qualified (as defined in § 121a.12 of Subpart A) and that activities sufficient to carry out this personnel development plan are scheduled; and

(c) Effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicaped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.381 Participation of other agencies and institutions.

(a) The State educational agency must insure that all public and private institutions of higher education, and other agencies and organizations (including representatives of handicapped, parent, and other advocacy organizations) in the State which have an interest in the preparation of personnel for the education of handicapped children, have an opportunity to participate fully in the development, review, and annual updating of the comprehensive system of personnel development.

(b) The annual program plan must describe the nature and extent of participation under paragraph (a) of this section and must describe responsibilities of the State educational agency, local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher education, and other agencies:

(1) With respect to the comprehensive system as a whole, and

(2) With respect to the personnel development plan under § 121a.383.

(20 U.S.C. 1412(7)(A); 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.382 Inservice training.

(a) As used in this section, "inservice training" means any training other than that received by an individual in a full-time program which leads to a degree.

(b) Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency:

(1) Conducts an annual needs assessment to determine if a sufficient number of qualified personnel are available in the State; and

(2) Initiates inservice personnel development programs based on the assessed needs of State-wide significance related to the implementation of the Act.

(c) Each annual program plan must include the results of the needs assessment under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, broken out by need for new personnel and need for retrained personnel.

(d) The State educational agency may enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies or other agencies, institutions, or organizations (which may include parent, handicapped, or other advocacy organizations), to carry out:

(1) Experimental or innovative personnel development programs;

(2) Development or modification of instructional materials; and

(3) Dissemination of significant information derived from educational research and demonstration projects.

(e) Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency insures that ongoing inservice training programs are available to all personnel who are engaged in the education of handicapped children, and that these programs include:

(1) The use of incentives which insure participation by teachers (such as released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills);

(2) The involvement of local staff; and

(3) The use of innovative practices which have been found to be effective.

(f) Each annual program plan must:

(1) Describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children;

(2) Identify the areas in which training is needed (such as individualized education programs, non-discriminatory testing, least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and surrogate parents);

(3) Specify the groups requiring training (such as special teachers, regular teachers, administrators, psychologists, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical education teachers, therapeutic recreation specialists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, medical personnel, parents, volunteers, hearing officers, and surrogate parents);

(4) Describe the content and nature of training for each area under paragraph (f)(2) of this section;

(5) Describe how the training will be provided in terms of (i) geographical scope (such as Statewide, regional, or local), and (ii) staff training source (such as college and university staffs, State and local educational agency personnel, and non-agency personnel);

(6) Specify: (i) The funding sources to be used, and

(ii) The time frame for providing it; and

(7) Specify procedures for effective evaluation of the extent to which program objectives are met.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.383 Personnel development plan.

Each annual program plan must: (a) Include a personnel development plan which provides a structure for personnel planning and focuses on preservice and inservice education needs;

(b) Describe the results of the needs assessment under § 121a.382(b)(1) with respect to identifying needed areas of training, and assigning priorities to those areas; and

(c) Identify the target populations for personnel development, including general education and special education instructional and administrative personnel, support personnel, and other personnel (such as paraprofessionals, parents, surrogate parents, and volunteers).

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.384 Dissemination.

(a) Each annual program plan must include a description of the State's procedures for acquiring, reviewing, and disseminating to general and special educational instructional and support personnel, administrators of programs for handicapped children, and other interested agencies and organizations (including parent, handicapped, and other advocacy organizations) significant information and promising practices derived from educational research, demonstration, and other projects.

(b) Dissemination includes:

(1) Making those personnel, administrators, agencies, and organizations aware of the information and practices;

(2) Training designed to enable the establishment of innovative programs and practices targeted on identified local needs; and

(3) Use of instructional materials and other media for personnel development and instructional programming.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.385 Adoption of educational practices.

(a) Each annual program plan must provide for a statewide system designed to adopt, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials proven effective through research and demonstration.

(b) Each annual program plan must provide for thorough reassessment of educational practices used in the State.

(c) Each annual program plan must provide for the identification of State, local, and regional resources (human and material) which will assist in meeting the State's personnel preparation needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.386 Evaluation.

Each annual program plan must include:

(a) Procedures for evaluating the overall effectiveness of:

(1) The comprehensive system of personnel development in meeting the needs for personnel, and

(2) The procedures for administration of the system; and

(b) A description of the monitoring activities that will be undertaken to assure the implementation of the comprehensive system of personnel development.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.387 Technical assistance to local educational agencies.

Each annual program plan must include a description of technical assistance that the State educational agency gives to local educational agencies in their implementation of the State's comprehensive system of personnel development.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

MAJOR AREAS OF INSERVICE TRAINING WITH REPRESENTATIVE TOPICS INCLUDED

The following headings and subtopics comprise a list of prioritized areas of training in which forty-five states, including the District of Columbia and four foreign territories, expressed a need. The areas of training are in rank order according to the number of states which indicated a need in that particular area. The number to the right is a tally of those states. For simplicity purposes the District of Columbia and the foreign territories are regarded as states.

1. Individualized Education Program (IEP): named by 49 states
   - How to develop an IEP
   - Programming for individual differences
   - IEP development requirements
   - Monitoring, review, and implementing IEPs
   - How to write goals and objectives
   - Conducting individual planning conferences
   - Knowledge of handicapped individuals' expectations

2. Least Restrictive Environment: named by 46 states
   - Techniques of implementing the least restrictive alternative in the placement for handicapped children
   - Least restrictive alternative model
   - Criteria for special education placement
   - The function of placement committees

2. Procedural Safeguards: named by 46 states
   - Due process hearings
   - Model for conducting hearings

2. Diagnostic Procedures: named by 46 states
   - Diagnostic prescriptive teaching techniques
   - Skills in using the prescriptive process
   - Diagnosing specific learning disabilities
   - Informal assessment skills
   - Formal assessment
   - Issues of pupil assessment

3. Instructional Procedures: named by 44 states
   - Instructional techniques
   - Special education teaching models and materials
   - Selection, development, and adaptation of media and materials for use with exceptional children
   - Utilization of proper materials (commercial and teacher-made) in implementing individualized education programs
   - Designing and producing teacher-made instructional material
   - Basic classroom skills
   - Investigating and testing new instructional approaches and teaching techniques
   - Instructional materials
   - Teaming skills

4. Non-discriminatory Testing: named by 43 states
   - Screening instruments and processes
   - Interpretation and use of evaluation information
   - Training in the multidisciplinary approach to evaluation and placement
   - Testing techniques

5. Implementation of P. L. 94-142: named by 39 states
   - Implications of P. L. 94-142
   - Fiscal implications of P. L. 94-142

5. Use of Surrogates: named by 39 states
   - Parent training management advocacy (surrogates included)

6. Priorities - Served - Unserved: named by 34 states
   - How to serve the 0-2 age deaf/blind student

7. Updating Professional Skills of Special Educators: named by 19 states
   - Retraining of all currently employed categorically trained teachers to function as resource room teachers and special class teachers
   - General special education: maintenance of preservice skills
   - Learning disabilities
   - Self-help: methods for teaching the profoundly handicapped, perceptual, motor
   - Deaf: sign language, visually handicapped, orthopedically handicapped
   - Teaching the mildly mentally handicapped
   - Education of the severely handicapped
   - Specific training for teachers of children with severe and profound handicapping conditions, particularly autistic, deaf-blind, and multi-handicapped
   - Emotional disturbance
   - Seriously emotionally disturbed
   - To upgrade professional techniques and competencies
   - Training teachers of speech impaired students
   - Methods for development of motor skills
   - Communication skills (oral/nonoral)

8. Training Regular Educators to Work with Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom: named by 17 states
   - Skills in reordering resources for both the special needs child and the "normal" child
   - Assisting regular classroom teachers
   - Techniques and procedures for modifying regular programs prior to referral
   - Resource programs
   - Teacher role
   - Preservice and inservice training of regular education teachers at all levels to work with children with special needs in the regular classroom dealing with attitudes as well as knowledge and skills

9. Workshops for Parents: named by 16 states
   - Establishing and enhancing the role of advisory councils
   - Parent training in diagnostic and instructional procedures and IEPs
   - Home and family education
   - Parent, participation, rights, involvement

10. Delivery of Services: named by 14 states
   - To increase professional educators' awareness of pupil personnel services
   - Working with special education resource personnel
   - Comprehensive services to the seriously emotionally handicapped
   - Planning, staffing, budgeting for special education
   - Implementation of home programs
   - Strategies for transportaion of handicapped students
   - Effective planning for severely and multiply handicapped students
   - Other educational aspects - programming for dear/blind

11. Orientation to Handicapping Conditions: named by 13 states
   - Survey courses in exceptional children
   - An awareness of handicapped characteristics, psychology, and potential facilitated by hands-on experience

12. Vocational Career Education: named by 12 states
   - Vocational education program modification
   - Prevocational programming for the deaf
   - Interaction between the teaching staffs in the area of vocational and special education

13. Preparation of Adapted Physical Education and Therapeutic Recreation Specialists: named by 10 states

13. Early Childhood: named by 10 states
   - Field based special education training for education personnel employed in integrated and specialized programs for young children with special needs

14. Preservice/Inservice: named by 9 states
   - How to set up and run effective inservice training programs as an ongoing function
   - Development of a pool of master inservice trainers
   - Collaboration between institutes of higher education and public schools, collaboratives, private schools, institutional schools, and/or human services agencies to provide inservice training
   - To promote inservice training activities
   - Inservice training regarding various aspects of special education for members of policy making groups

14. Consultative Skills: named by 9 states
    - Facilitating communication among parents, teachers, administrators, public
    - Developing inter-teacher communication
    - Consultative skills for special education personnel (including working with parents and others)
    - Parent education training for professionals relative to educating parents

15. Evaluation: named by 8 states
    - Utilization of informal evaluations
    - Methods for evaluating pupil progress

16. Understanding Relevant Legislation (State & Federal): named by 7 states
    - Legal aspects of special education
    - To inform clientele of current rules and regulations

16. Training to Broaden Competence of Specialist Personnel in Education Settings: named by 7 states
    - Training of hearing officers, speech clinicians, and others

16. Management of Behavior: named by 7 states
    - Observation of behavior

17. Preparation of Secondary Level Special Education Personnel: named by 6 states
    - Preparation of secondary level special education personnel in formal and informal settings

17. Skill Development of Paraprofessional: named by 6 states

17. Classroom Management: named by 6 states

18. School Related Personnel Who Have Specific Responsibilities under the Law: named by 5 states
    - Special education training for public school administrators in general and special education

19. Preparation of Special Education Personnel from Bilingual and Minority Groups ...: named by 3 states

20. Arts for the Handicapped: named by 2 states

20. Funding Sources: named by 2 states

20. Certification for Special Education Teachers: named by 2 states

20. Reading Skills: named by 2 states

21. Retraining of Regular and Special Education Teachers as General Special Teachers: named by 1 state
    - Retraining of regular education teachers to function as resource teachers working with children with a variety of moderate special needs

21. Understanding the Educational System Outside of Special Education: named by 1 state

21. Coordination with Institutes of Higher Education: named by 1 state

21. Counseling for Delinquency: named by 1 state

21. Drug Abuse: named by 1 state

21. Alternative Life Styles: named by 1 state

21. Admissions and Release Committee Process: named by 1 state

21. Cognition: named by 1 state

21. Leadership Training: named by 1 state

21. Medical Involvement: named by 1 state

21. Evaluation of Staff: named by 1 state